

From: Maureen Rose George [mrglaw@npgcable.com]

Sent: Friday, June 13, 2008 11:20 AM

To: Doug W. Dunham

Cc: 'Tom Griffin'

Subject: MCWA Comment on Adequacy Rules

Doug, thank you for taking the time to speak with me today about the adequacy rules. The only comment of MCWA at this time, on the May 14 draft, is as follows:

R12-15-713M: M.2.d. refers to "municipal physical works" and yet the introductory paragraph to "M" does not require the project supply project to be a "municipal" project. The discussions at SWAG, and the language of 45-108.03 would indicate that the intent of the legislation was to grant this exemption if there was a bona fide municipal water provider project underway and with adequate commitments for completion. This exemption arose out of discussions of the development permitted to occur while the CAP was pending completion. Adding the word "municipal" fore "water supply project" in the first line would address this concern and be consistent with the proposed rule language in M.2.d.

Do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions on the foregoing. Thanks.

Maureen

Law Offices of Maureen Rose George PC

2000 McCulloch Blvd. N., Suite B

Lake Havasu City, AZ 86403

Phone: 928 453-5150

Fax: 928 484-2223

mrglaw@npgcable.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained in this message may be protected by the attorney client privilege. Please immediately reply to the sender of this email if you have received it in error, then delete. Thank you.

"As you drink the water, remember the spring." - Chinese proverb